arXiv:0911.1809v2 [math.PR] 1 Mar 2011

LARGE DEVIATIONS FOR PROCESSES IN RANDOM ENVIRONMENTS WITH JUMPS

IVAN MATIC

ABSTRACT. A deterministic walk in a random environment can be understood as a general random process with finite-range dependence that starts repeating the loop once it reaches a site it has visited before. Such process lacks the Markov property. We study the exponential decay of the probabilities that the walk will reach sites located far away from the origin. We also study the similar problem for the continuous analogue, i.e., the process that is a solution to an ODE with random coefficients. In this second model the environment also has "teleports," which are the regions from where the process can make discontinuous jumps.

1. INTRODUCTION

A deterministic process in a random environment is a solution to the differential equation $\frac{dX_t}{dt} = b(X_t,\omega)$, $X_0 = 0$, where the vector field $b:\mathbb{R}^d\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^d$ is defined on a probability space $(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$. We are interested in the large deviation properties of the solution X_t. The process is called deterministic, because, once the environment is sampled from the probability space Ω, the entire process depends only on the initial position X_0.

We will consider the modified version of the previous process, in which we allow for certain randomness in time. The environment is located in the Poisson point process, and small neighborhoods of the Poisson points serve as teleports. Once the particle spends sufficient time within a teleport, it is subject to a jump. However, whether the jump will occur or not is going to depend on additional time-dependent random sequence.

Under some additional assumptions on b and the environment, we will establish the following result about the moment generating functions of X_t.

Theorem 1.1. *Under the assumptions from the section 7 there exists a convex function* $\Lambda:\mathbb{R}^d\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda\cdot X_t}\right]=\Lambda(\lambda).$$

Here $\mathbb{E}$ denotes the expected value with respect to all randomness. This is known as an *annealed* or *averaged* process.

To get an idea on how to approach the problem we first consider a discrete analogue – the model of a deterministic walk in a random environment. We look at a random sequence X_n defined recursively as $X_{n+1}-X_n = b(X_n,\omega)$, for suitable function $b:\mathbb{Z}^d\times\Omega\to\mathbb{Z}^d$. Our aim is to establish the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $(\eta_z)_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ *be a stationary* $\mathbb{Z}^d$*-valued random field that satisfy the assumptions (i)–(iii) (we refer to the assumptions from the section 2). The random variable* X_n *is defined as* $X_0=0$, $X_{n+1}=X_n+\eta_{X_n}$. *Then there exists a convex function* $\Lambda:\mathbb{R}^d\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda\cdot X_n}\right]=\Lambda(\lambda).$$

Notice that we may assume that the field $b(x,\omega)$ is of the form $b(x,\omega)=\eta_x$, where η is a random field on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. The field η itself could be understood as the random environment in which the walk occurs. When the particular realization of the environment is fixed, the walk becomes deterministic.

One of the main characteristics of this walk is that once the loop occurs, the walk will start repeating the loop forever.

In order to make some connections of this model with the one of the random walk in a random environment, we start from the representation of X_n as $X_{n+1} - X_n = b(X_n, \omega, \pi)$. Here $b : \mathbb{Z}^d \times \Omega \times \Pi \to \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a random variable, and $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, (Π, P) are probability spaces. In this model, $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ is the environment, and for each fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, the walk X_n could be understood as a random walk on probability space (Π, P). Recent works [13] and [5] have established the quenched and annealed large deviations for the random walk in a random environment under certain non-degeneracy assumptions on (Π, P). The articles [9] and [14] found variational formulas for the rate functions and some connections between the two rate functions. The model we are studying is related to the annealed (averaged) case studied in the mentioned papers. Here, the probability space (Π, P) is very degenerate.

The main idea for the proof is the adaptation of the subadditive argument. However, we need some work to find a quantity that happens to be subadditive. This quantity is found in section 4 where we prove that it has the same exponential rate of decay as our large deviation probabilities. After that we are ready for the proofs of the main theorems which are presented in the section 5. Section 6 contains an easy consequence, i.e. the law of large numbers. The law of large numbers with limiting velocity 0 for the deterministic walk in random environment is not a surprising fact. It is intuitive that the loop will occur, the expected time of the occurrence of the loop is finite, hence the walk can't go too far.

We are assuming that the environment has finite-range dependence. The special case is the iid environment where many of the presented arguments can be simplified. We are not assuming that the walk is nearest–neighbor. We do assume however, certain *ellipticity* conditions on the environment: There is a *nice* set of vectors such that using only these vectors the walk can move in any direction. Our ellipticity condition is the assumption that the probability that the walk at any position of the environment takes any particular vector from the *nice* set is uniformly positive.

In the next section we state the assumptions we impose to the model and state the theorem 2.1 that will be the main focus of our study. In order to prove it we will need some deterministic lemmas that establish the uniform bounds on the probabilities that the walk can go virtually in any direction. These statements are stated and proved in section 3. In the end we discuss the generalization of this approach to the continuous setting.

Many of the arguments here involve the consideration of the position of the particle at the time of the first self-intersection. Other interesting results regarding self-intersection times of random walks can be found in [1] and [2]. The hitting times and back-tracking times were a useful tool in establishing the laws of large numbers of for ballistic random diffusions (see [10]).

2. DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Definition 2.1. *The set of vectors* $\{u_1, \dots, u_m\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ *is called* nice *if for every* $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *there exists* $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ *such that* $l \cdot u_i > 0$.

Let $(\eta_z)_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ be a stationary $\mathbb{Z}^d$-valued random field that satisfies the following conditions:

(i) There exists a positive real number L such that $|\eta_z| \leq L$ for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

(ii) There exists a real number M such that η_z is independent of the environment outside of the ball with center z and radius M.

(iii) There exist a nice set of vectors $\{u_1, \dots, u_m\} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\eta_z = u_i | \mathscr{F}_z) > c$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, where $\mathscr{F}_z$ is a sigma-algebra generated by all η_w for $w \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $0 < |w - z| \leq M$.

The last assumption implies the existence of a loop in any half-space with a positive probability (see theorem 3.1). It also implies that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\eta_z \cdot l > 0|\mathscr{F}_z) > c$ for every z.

A special case is the iid environment when in condition (ii) we require $M < 1$. The condition (iii) is then replaced by $\mathbb{P}(\eta_z = u_i) > c$ for all i. Many of the arguments would become simpler and/or less technical if we assumed that the environment is iid.

The random variable X_n is defined recursively as $X_0 = 0$ and: $X_{n+1} = X_n + \eta_{X_n}$.

We will use the following equivalent interpretation of X_n. The process X_n behaves like a random walk until the first self intersection. The increments of the random walk are sampled at every step according to the law of the random field η_z. After the self intersection occurs, the walk becomes deterministic and repeats the loop.

Here is the precise definition of the walk X_n that we will use. Let ξ_n be a $\mathbb{Z}^d$-valued random sequence defined recursively: $\xi_0 = 0$, and $\xi_n = \eta_{\xi_0+\cdots+\xi_{n-1}}$. Let us define $Y_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \xi_k$ and

$$\tau = \inf\{n : Y_n \in \{Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-1}\}\}.$$

Let $\theta \leq \tau$ be the smallest integer such that $Y_\tau = Y_\theta$. We define the walk X_n using the formula:

$$X_n = \begin{cases} Y_n, & n \leq \tau, \\ Y_{\theta+v}, & n - \tau = u(\tau - \theta) + v, 0 \leq v < \theta - \tau. \end{cases}$$

Let $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a unit vector. Define $T^l_m = \inf\{n : X_n \cdot l \geq m\}$. Denote by Z^l_x the hyperplane through $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ orthogonal to the vector l. Let us further denote by H^l_x the half-space through x determined by the vector l as

$$H^l_x = \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \left\{ x + v : v \in \mathbb{R}^d, l \cdot v \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Our goal is to prove the large deviations for X_n (see the theorem 5.2). We will be able to use the Ellis-Gartner theorem to get some further bounds once we establish the following result:

Theorem 2.1. *Let X_n be the random walk defined as above. Assume that the random environment satisfies the conditions (i)–(iii). For each unit vector $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists a concave function $\phi^l : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{R}_+$:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot l \geq nk) \quad = \quad \phi^l(k). \tag{1}$$

Remark. Notice that $\phi^l(k) = \phi^{tl}(tk)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Therefore $\phi^l(k) = \Phi\left(\frac{1}{k} l\right)$ for a suitable function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$.

3. EXISTENCE OF A LOOP

In this section we prove that the previously defined random walk will have a loop in each half-space with a positive probability. This fact will be a consequence of the following elementary lemma. The lemma states that there exists a loop consisting entirely of vectors from a nice set.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$ be a nice set of non-zero vectors. There exist non-negative integers $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m$ not all equal to 0 such that $q_1u_1 + \cdots + q_mu_m = 0$.*

Proof. We will prove the statement using the induction on the dimension d. The statement is easy to prove for $d = 1$ and $d = 2$. We may assume that $\{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$ is a minimal nice set, i.e. there is no proper nice subset of $\{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$. If not, take the proper nice subset and repeat the argument. Let us fix the vector u_m, and let $v_i = u_i - \frac{u_i \cdot u_m}{|u_m|^2} u_m$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-1$. All vectors $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}$ have rational coordinates. Let r be the common denominator of those fractions and consider the lattice D of size $1/r$ in the vector space determined by the span W of $v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}$. Let us prove that the set

$\{v_1,\dots,v_{m-1}\}$ is nice in W. Let $\tilde{l}\in W$ be a vector with real coordinates. There exists $i\in\{1,2,\dots,m\}$ such that $u_i\cdot\tilde{l}>0$. Since $\tilde{l}\in W$ we immediately have that $u_m\cdot\tilde{l}=0$ and $u_i\cdot\tilde{l}=v_i\cdot\tilde{l}$ hence $v_i\cdot\tilde{l}>0$. This implies that $\{v_1,\dots,v_{m-1}\}$ is a nice set of vectors in W. According to the induction hypothesis there are non-negative integers $q_1',\dots,q_{m-1}'$ such that $q_1'v_1+\cdots+q_{m-1}'v_{m-1}=0$. We now have

$$|u_m|^2(q_1'u_1+\cdots+q_{m-1}'u_{m-1})=\left(q_1'u_1\cdot u_m+\cdots+q_{m-1}'u_{m-1}\cdot u_m\right)u_m.$$

Let us now prove that $q_1'u_1\cdot u_m+\cdots+q_{m-1}'u_{m-1}\cdot u_m\leq 0$. Assume the contrary, that this number were greater than 0. Since $\{u_1,\dots,u_{m-1}\}$ is not a nice set (due to our minimality assumption for $\{u_1,\dots,u_m\}$) there exists a vector $l\in\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $l\cdot u_m>0$ but $l\cdot u_k\leq 0$ for each $k\in\{1,2,\dots,m-1\}$. This gives that

$$0 \quad\geq\quad l\cdot(q_1'u_1+\cdots+q_{m-1}'u_{m-1})|u_m|^2=\left(q_1'u_1\cdot u_m+\cdots+q_{m-1}'u_{m-1}\cdot u_m\right)u_m\cdot l>0,$$

a contradiction. Therefore $q_1'u_1\cdot u_m+\cdots+q_{m-1}'u_{m-1}\cdot u_m\leq 0$. We can now choose $q_i=|u_m|^2q_i'$, $i=1,2,\dots,m-1$, and $q_m=-(q_1'u_1\cdot u_m+\cdots+q_{m-1}'u_{m-1}\cdot u_m)$ to obtain $q_1u_1+\cdots+q_mu_m=0$. This completes the proof. □

The following theorem says that in each half-space H_x^l a walk X_n starting from x can have a loop in H_x^l with a probability that is strictly greater than 0. Because of the stationarity it suffices to prove this for half-spaces through the origin.

Theorem 3.1. *There exist constants $m\in\mathbb{N}$, $c_1\in\mathbb{R}_+$ such that: For each unit vector $l\in\mathbb{R}^d$ there exist an integer $s\leq m$ and a sequence $x_0=0$, x_1, x_2, …, $x_s\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that:*

(i) $\sum_{i=0}^{p}x_i\cdot l\geq 0$ *for all* $0\leq p\leq s$,
(ii) $\sum_{i=0}^{p}x_i\neq\sum_{i=0}^{q}x_i$ *for all* $0\leq p<q\leq s-1$,
(iii) $\sum_{i=0}^{s}x_i=0$, *and*
(iv) *For $y_i=x_0+\cdots+x_{i-1}$, let us denote by $\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s}$ the σ-algebra generated by all random variables η_z for $z\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{y_1,\dots,y_s\}$ such that* $\min_{1\leq i\leq s}|z-y_i|\leq M$. *Then:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_1=x_1,\xi_2=x_2,\dots,\xi_s=x_s|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s})\geq c_1.$$

Proof. Let us prove that there exist vectors $x_1,\dots,x_s\in\{u_1,\dots,u_m\}$ for which (i)–(iii) are satisfied. Then (iv) will be satisfied as well. To see that let us denote by $\mathscr{G}_{y_s}^{y_1,\dots,y_{s-1}}$ the sigma algebra generated by all random variables η_z for $z\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{y_s\}$ such that $\min_{1\leq i\leq s}|z-y_i|\leq M$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\xi_1=x_1,\xi_2=x_2,\dots,\xi_s=x_s|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s})\\
= & \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(1(\xi_1=x_1)\cdots 1(\xi_s=x_s)|\mathscr{G}_{y_s}^{y_1,\dots,y_{s-1}}\right)\Big|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s}\right)\\
= & \mathbb{E}\left(1(\xi_1=x_1)\cdots 1(\xi_{s-1}=x_{s-1})\cdot\mathbb{E}\left(1(\xi_s=x_s)|\mathscr{G}_{y_s}^{y_1,\dots,y_{s-1}}\right)\Big|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s}\right)\\
> & c\cdot\mathbb{P}(\xi_1=x_1,\dots,\xi_{s-1}=x_{s-1}|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s})\\
= & c\cdot\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{P}(\xi_1=x_1,\dots,\xi_{s-1}=x_{s-1}|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_{s-1}})|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can continue by induction to obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_1=x_1,\dots,\xi_s=x_s|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s})>c^s.$$

Using the lemma 3.1 we have that there exists a sequence $z_1,\dots,z_s\in\{u_1,\dots,u_m\}$ such that $z_1+\cdots+z_s=0$. Assume that this sequence is the sequence of minimal length. Let us choose the index π such that that $(z_1+\cdots+z_\pi)\cdot l$ is minimal (of all $j=1,2,\dots,s$). Then $x_1=z_{\pi+1}$, $z_2=y_{\pi+2}$, …, $z_s=y_{\pi+s}$ (indeces are modulo s) satisfy $z_1+z_2+\cdots+z_s=0$, and

$$(x_1+x_2+\cdots+x_j)\cdot l\geq 0\quad\text{for all } j=1,2,\dots,s.$$

Let us prove the last inequality. Assume the contrary, that $(x_1+\cdots+x_j)\cdot l<0$. Assume first that $\pi+j\leq s$. Then $(z_1+\cdots+z_{\pi+j})\cdot l=(z_1+\cdots+z_\pi)\cdot l+(x_1+\cdots+x_j)\cdot l<(z_1+\cdots+z_\pi)\cdot l$ which contradicts the choice of π. If $\pi+j>s$ and $\pi+j\equiv t \pmod s$ then $0=l\cdot(z_1+\cdots+z_\pi+x_1+\cdots+x_{s-\pi})<l\cdot(z_1+\cdots+z_t+x_1+\cdots+x_{s-\pi})=l\cdot(x_1+\cdots+x_j)<0$, a contradiction. This proves (i). The condition (ii) follows from the requirement that the sequence $z_1,\dots,z_n$ is the shortest. □

Using the previous two lemmas we can establish the equality analogous to the one from the theorem 2.1 in which $k=0$.

Theorem 3.2. *For each vector $l\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and X_n defined as before the following equality holds:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq 0)=0.$$

Proof. The inequality $\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq 0)\leq 1$ implies that $\limsup\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq 0)\leq 0$. For the other inequality we use the theorem 3.1. Let $x_1,\dots,x_s$ be the sequence whose existence is claimed by that theorem. Let $y_i=x_0+\cdots+x_{i-1}$ as before. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq 0) &\geq \mathbb{P}(\xi_1=x_1,\xi_2=x_2,\dots,\xi_s=x_s)\\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_1=x_1,\xi_2=x_2,\dots,\xi_s=x_s|\mathscr{F}_{y_1,\dots,y_s}\right)\right)\\ &\geq c_1.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\liminf\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq 0)\geq\liminf\frac{1}{n}\log c_1=0$. □

We will also need the following deterministic lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $\{u_1,\dots,u_m\}\subseteq\mathbb{Z}^d$ is a nice set of vectors. Let $\rho:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}_+\cup\{0\}$ be the function defined as $\rho(l)=\max_i\{u_i\cdot l\}$. Then*

$$\inf_{l:|l|=1}\rho(l)>0.$$

Proof. First notice that $\rho(l)>0$ for each $l\in\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\{0\}$. Otherwise the set $\{u_1,\dots,u_m\}$ would not be nice. Notice also that ρ is a continuous function (because it is a maximum of m continuous functions) and the unit sphere is a compact set. Thus the infimum of ρ over the unit sphere must be attained at some point, and we have just proved that value of ρ at any single point is not 0. □

4. HITTING TIMES OF HYPERPLANES

The main idea for the proof of the theorem 2.1 is to establish the asymptotic equivalence of $\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq nk)$ and a sequence to which we can apply the deterministic superadditive lemmas. First we will prove that the previous sequence behaves like $\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T^l_{nk}\leq n)$. Then we will see that the asymptotic behavior of the latter sequence satisfies

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T^l_{nk}\leq n)\sim\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T^l_{nk}\leq n,T^l_{nk}\leq D^l_1)$$

where D^l_1 is the first time the walk returns over the hyperplane Z^l_0. This probability captures those walks that don't backtrack over the hyperplane Z^l_0.

We will be able to prove the existence of the limit of the last sequence using a modification of the standard subadditive lemma that states that $\lim\frac{a_n}{n}=\inf\frac{a_n}{n}$ if $a_{n+m}\leq a_n+a_m$ for all $m,n\in\mathbb{N}$.

From now on let us fix the vector $l\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and let us omit the superscript l in the variables. Also, some of the new variables that will be defined would need to have a superscript l but we will omit it as well.

Our first result in carrying out the formerly described plan is the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *The following inequality holds:*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq nk)\quad\leq\quad\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{nk}\leq n)$$

In addition, for each $\varepsilon>0$ *we have:*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{n(k+\varepsilon)}\leq n)\quad\leq\quad\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq nk).$$

Proof. Clearly, $\{X_n\cdot l\geq kn\}\subseteq\{T_{kn}\leq n\}$. Therefore $\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq kn)\leq\mathbb{P}(T_{kn}\leq n)$. This establishes the first inequality. Let $x_0,\dots,x_s$ be the sequence whose existence follows from the theorem 3.1. We now have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq kn) &= \mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq kn, T_{kn}\leq n)\\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left(X_n\cdot l\geq kn, T_{kn}\leq n-s, X_{T_{kn}+1}-X_{T_{kn}}=x_1,\dots,X_{T_{kn}+s}-X_{T_{kn}+s-1}=x_s\right)\\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(T_{kn}\leq n-s, X_{T_{kn}+1}-X_{T_{kn}}=x_1,\dots,X_{T_{kn}+s}-X_{T_{kn}+s-1}=x_s\right) \qquad (2)\\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[1(T_{nk}\leq n-s)\mathbb{E}\left[1(\xi_{T_{kn}}=x_1)\cdots 1(\xi_{T_{kn}+s-1}=x_s)\middle|\mathcal{F}_{T_{kn}}\right]\right]\\
&\geq c_1\cdot\mathbb{P}\left(T_{kn}\leq n-s\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathcal{F}_{T_{kn}}$ denotes the σ-algebra defined by η_z for $z\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $|z-X_i|\leq M$ for $i=1,2,\dots,T_{kn}$. The equality in (2) holds because if $T_{kn}\leq n-s$ and $X_{T_{kn}+1}-X_{T_{kn}}=x_1$, …, $X_{T_{kn}+s}-X_{T_{kn}+s-1}=x_s$, then the walk will enter in a loop. This loop will be in the half-space H_{kn} which would guarantee that $X_n\cdot l>kn$.

For each $\varepsilon>0$, if $n>s+sk/\varepsilon$ we have $\{T_{(k+\varepsilon)(n-s)}\leq n-s\}\subseteq\{T_{kn}\leq n-s\}$, and consequently the first set has the smaller probability than the second. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Remark. In the same way we could obtain the analogous inequalities with the walk X_n replaced by $X_{n\wedge\tau}$.

For each integer $i\geq1$ denote by D_i the time of the ith jump over the hyperplane Z_0 in the direction of the vector l. Define $D_0=0$ and we allow for D_i to be ∞.

Lemma 4.2. *Let k and k' be two real numbers such that* $0<k'<k$. *Then the following two inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{nk}\leq n) &\leq \limsup\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{nk'}\leq n, T_{nk'}\leq D_1)\\
\liminf\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\left(T_{nk}\leq n, T_{nk}\leq D_1\right) &\leq \liminf\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\left(T_{nk}\leq n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(T_u\leq n\right)\quad=\quad\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{P}\left(T_u\leq n, D_i\leq T_u\leq D_{i+1}\right).$$

We will prove that each term from the right-hand side of the previous equality is bounded above by $L^dn^{d-1}\cdot\mathbb{P}(T_{u-L}\leq n, T_{u-L}\leq D_1)$. Let Z_0' be the set of all points $z\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $z\cdot l>0$ and the distance between z and Z_0 is at most L. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(T_u\leq n, D_i\leq T_u\leq D_{i+1}\right) &= \sum_{z\in Z_0',|z|\leq nL}\mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u\leq n)\cdot 1(X_{D_i}=z)\cdot 1(T_u\geq D_i)\right.\\
&\qquad \left.\cdot 1(T_u\leq D_{i+1})\right]\\
&= \sum_{z\in Z_0',|z|\leq nL}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u\leq n)\cdot 1(X_{D_i}=z)\cdot 1(T_u\geq D_i)\right.\right.\\
&\qquad \left.\left.\cdot\, 1(T_u\leq D_{i+1})\middle|\mathcal{F}_{D_i,T_u}\right]\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathscr{F}_{D_i,T_u}$ denotes the σ-algebra generated by the random environment that is contained in the M-neighborhood of the walk from D_i to T_u. When conditioning on this σ-field we essentially understand our environment in the following way: It consists of two walks: One deterministic that goes from z to Z_u without crossing the hyperplane Z_0, and another walk that starts at 0 and ends in z by making exactly i crossings over Z_0, not intersecting the other deterministic walk, and not crossing over Z_u. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{z\in Z_0',|z|\leq nL} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u\leq n)\cdot 1(X_{D_i}=z)\cdot 1(T_u\geq D_i)\cdot 1(T_u\leq D_{i+1})\mid \mathscr{F}_{D_i,T_u}\right]\right] \\ \leq\; & \sum_{z\in Z_0',|z|\leq nL} \mathbb{E}\left[1(\tilde{T}_{u-L}\leq n-D_i)\cdot 1(\tilde{T}_{u-L}\leq \tilde{D}_1)\cdot \mathbb{E}\left[1(X_{D_i}=z)\cdot 1(T_u\geq D_i)|\mathscr{F}_{D_i,T_u}\right]\right] \\ \leq\; & \sum_{z\in Z_0,|z|\leq nL} \mathbb{E}\left[1(\tilde{T}_{u-L}\leq n)\cdot 1(\tilde{T}_{u-L}\leq \tilde{D}_1)\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{T}_u$ is defined in analogous way as T_u to correspond to the new walk $\tilde{X}_j=X_{D_i+j}$. In the last equation $\tilde{D}_1$ is defined as the first time of crossing over the hyperplane Γ parallel to Z_0 that is shifted by the vector $-L\frac{l}{|l|}$. Let us now prove that $\mathbb{P}(T_{u-L}\leq n, T_{u-L}\leq \tilde{D}_1)\leq L^d n^{d-1}\cdot\mathbb{P}(T_{u-2L}\leq n, T_{u-L}\leq D_1)$. Denote by J the closest time the walk comes to the hyperplane Γ. The number of possible positions of the walk is at most $L^d n^{d-1}$ and similarly as above, conditioning on the σ-filed between J and T_{u-L} we get $\mathbb{P}(T_{u-L}\leq n, T_{u-L}\leq \tilde{D}_1)\leq L^d n^{d-1}\cdot \mathbb{P}(T_{u-2L}\leq n, T_{u-L}\leq D_1)$. We now have

$$\mathbb{P}(T_u\leq n, D_i\leq T_u\leq D_{i+1})\leq L^{2d}n^{2d-2}\mathbb{P}(T_{u-2L}\leq n, T_{u-2L}\leq D_1).$$

This implies that $\mathbb{P}(T_u\leq n)\leq L^{2d}n^{2d-1}\mathbb{P}(T_{u-2L}\leq n, T_{u-2L}\leq D_1)$. Therefore

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{nk}\leq n)\leq \limsup\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{nk-2L}\leq n, T_{nk-2L}\leq D_1).$$

For each $k'<k$ we have

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{nk}\leq n)\leq \limsup\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{nk'}\leq n, T_{nk'}\leq D_1).$$

On the other hand, it is obvious that

$$\liminf \frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\left(T_{nk}\leq n, T_{nk}\leq D_1\right)\leq \liminf\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\left(T_{nk}\leq n\right),$$

because $\{T_{nk}\leq n\}\supseteq\{T_{nk}\leq n, T_{nk}\leq D_1\}$. □

5. LARGE DEVIATIONS ESTIMATES

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem:

Proof of the Theorem 2.1. We will prove that for each unit vector l there exists a concave function $\psi:\mathbb{R}_+\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}(T_{nk}\leq n) \quad = \quad \psi(k). \tag{3}$$

Because of the Lemma 4.2 it suffices to prove that there exists a concave function $\gamma:\mathbb{R}_+\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\left(T_{nk}\leq n, T_{nk}\leq D_1\right) \quad = \quad \gamma(k). \tag{4}$$

Let $w\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ be a vector such that $w\cdot l>0$ and $\mathbb{P}(\eta_z=w|\mathscr{F}_z)\geq c>0$ for some constant c. Assume that r is an integer such that the distance between the hyperplanes Z_{rw} and Z_0 is at least M. If u,v,p,q

are any four positive real numbers such that $q > r$, then the following inequality holds:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1\right) \quad \geq \quad c \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_u \leq p, T_u \leq D_1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_v \leq q-r, T_v \leq D_1). \tag{5}$$

If the environment were iid this could have been done by conditioning on $\mathscr{F}_u$. In our situation the idea is the same, we just need some more work to compensate for the lack of independence.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1, T_u \leq p\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u \leq p) \cdot 1(T_u \leq D_1) \cdot 1(\xi_{T_u} = w) \cdot \cdots \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot 1(\xi_{T_u+r-1} = w) \cdot 1(T_{u+v} \leq p+q) \cdot 1(T_{u+v} \leq D_1)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u \leq p) \cdot 1(T_u \leq D_1) \cdot 1(\xi_{T_u} = w) \cdot \cdots \cdot 1(\xi_{T_u+r-1} = w)\right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left. \cdot 1(T_{u+v} \leq p+q) \cdot 1(T_{u+v} \leq D_1) \middle| \mathscr{F}_{\left[X_{T_u}, X_{T_{u+rw\cdot l}}\right]}\right]\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathscr{F}_{[a,b]}$ is the σ-algebra determined by the environment outside of the strip $[Z_a, Z_b]$. Let us introduce the following notation: $\hat{X}_i = X_{T_u+r-1+i}$, $\hat{D}_1$ the first time $\hat{X}_i$ jumps over $Z_{X_{T_u}+rw}$, and $\hat{T}_v = \inf\{i : \hat{X}_i \cdot l \geq v\}$. We now have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1) &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u \leq p) \cdot 1(T_u \leq D_1) \cdot 1(\xi_{T_u} = w) \cdot \cdots \cdot 1(\xi_{T_u+r-1} = w)\right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left. \cdot 1(\hat{T}_v \leq q-r) \cdot 1(\hat{T}_v \leq \hat{D}_1) \middle| \mathscr{F}_{\left[X_{T_u}, X_{T_{u+rw\cdot l}}\right]}\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u \leq p) \cdot 1(T_u \leq D_1) \cdot 1(\hat{T}_v \leq q-r) \cdot 1(\hat{T}_v \leq \hat{D}_1) \cdot \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbb{E}\left[1(\xi_{T_u} = w) \cdot \cdots \cdot 1(\xi_{T_u+r-1} = w) \middle| \mathscr{F}_{\left[X_{T_u}, X_{T_{u+rw\cdot l}}\right]}\right]\right] \\ &\geq c \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_u \leq p, T_u \leq D_1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_v \leq q-r, T_v \leq D_1). \end{aligned}$$

Let us explain why one can bound $\mathbb{E}[1(\xi_{T_u} = w) \cdots 1(\xi_{T_u+r-1} = w) | \mathscr{F}_{[X_{T_u}, X_{T_{u+rw\cdot l}}]}]$ below by c. The quantity in question is a random variable, and we are only considering that random variable on the set $\{T_u \leq D_1\} \cap \{\hat{T}_v \leq \hat{D}_1\}$. On that set the random walk doesn't visit the sites $X_{T_u}, \dots, X_{T_u+r-1}$ hence we can use our ellipticity assumption. This establishes (5). Let $\delta(m,x) = \log \mathbb{P}(T_{mx} \leq m, T_{mx} \leq D_1)$. Applying the inequality (5) to the numbers $u = nk$, $v = mk$, $p = n$, $q = m$ yields the following relation

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(m+n,k) &\geq \log c + \delta(n,k) + \log \mathbb{P}(T_{mk} \leq m-r, T_{mk} \leq D_1) \\ &\geq \log c + \delta(n,k) + \delta(m-r,k'), \end{aligned}$$

where k' is any real number greater than k for which $(m-r)k' \geq mk$. For now on we will write c instead of $\log c$. In other words, for each k, and each $k' > k$ we have

$$\delta(m+n,k) \quad \geq \quad c + \delta(m,k) + \delta(n-r,k'), \tag{6}$$

for all m, n such that $n \geq \frac{rk'}{k'-k}$. Let

$$\underline{\delta}(k) = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\delta(n,k)}{n}, \quad \overline{\delta}(k) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\delta(n,k)}{n}.$$

If $k < k'$ then for each $\alpha < \overline{\delta}(k')$ there exists a sequence n_t that goes to infinity such that $\frac{\delta(n_t,k')}{n_t} \geq \alpha$. For each fixed n_t and each $n \geq n_t$ there exist integers $a \geq 0$ and $b \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n_t + r - 1\}$ such that $n = a(n_t+r)+b$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta(n,k)}{n} &= \frac{\delta(a(n_t+r)+b,n)}{a(n_t+r)+b} \geq \frac{(a-1)\delta(n_t,k')+\delta(n_t+r+b,k)+(a-1)c}{a(n_t+r)+b} \\ &\geq \frac{\delta(n_t,k')}{n_t}\cdot\frac{(a-1)\cdot n_t}{a(n_t+r)+b}+\frac{\delta(n_t+r+b,k)}{a(n_t+r)+b}+\frac{(a-1)c}{a(n_t+r)+b} \\ &\geq \alpha\cdot\frac{(a-1)\cdot n_t}{a(n_t+r)+b}+\frac{\delta(n_t+r+b,k)}{a(n_t+r)+b}+\frac{(a-1)c}{a(n_t+r)+b}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $\mu > 0$ there exists t_0 such that for all $t > t_0$ we have

$$\left|\frac{(a-1)c}{a(n_t+r)+b}\right| < \mu$$

uniformly in a and b. There exists n_0 such that for all $n > n_0$, the number $a = \left[\frac{n}{n_t+r}\right]$ would be large enough to guarantee

$$\left|\frac{\delta(n_t+r+b,k)}{a(n_t+r)+b}\right| < \mu \text{ and } \left|\frac{(a-1)n_t}{a(n_t+r)+b}-1\right| \leq \frac{\mu}{|\alpha|+1}.$$

This implies that $\underline{\delta}(k) \geq \alpha - 3\mu$ for all $\mu > 0$, therefore $\underline{\delta}(k) > \alpha$ for all $\alpha < \overline{\delta}(k')$. This immediately yields to $\underline{\delta}(k) \geq \overline{\delta}(k')$ for all $k < k'$. Obviously $\overline{\delta}(k) \geq \underline{\delta}(k)$ hence we have

$$\underline{\delta}(k') \leq \overline{\delta}(k') \leq \underline{\delta}(k) \leq \overline{\delta}(k), \text{ for all } k < k'.$$

A consequence of the previous inequality is the monotonicity of the functions $\overline{\delta}$ and $\underline{\delta}$. They are both non-increasing. Let α and β be two positive rational numbers such that $\alpha+\beta = 1$. Let k_1 and k_2 be any two positive real numbers. According to (5) we know that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(n,\alpha k_1+\beta k_2) &= \log\mathbb{P}(T_{n(\alpha k_1+\beta k_2)} \leq \alpha n+\beta n, T_{n(\alpha k_1+\beta k_2)} \leq D_1) \\ &\geq \log\mathbb{P}(T_{n\alpha k_1} \leq \alpha n, T_{n\alpha k_1} \leq D_1)+ \\ &\quad \log\mathbb{P}(T_{n\beta k_2} \leq \beta n - r, T_{n\beta k_2} \leq D_1)+c \\ &\geq \delta(\alpha n,k_1)+\delta(\beta n,k_2')+c, \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large n, where k_2' is any number larger than k_2. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\delta}(\alpha k_1+\beta k_2) &\geq \limsup \frac{1}{n}\left(\delta(\alpha n,k_1)+\delta(\beta n,k_2')\right) \\ &\geq \alpha\underline{\delta}(k_1)+\beta\underline{\delta}(k_2'). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Let us justify the second inequality. The previous $\limsup$ is definitely larger than the $\liminf$ over the sequence of those integers n that are divisible by the denominators of both α and β.

Consider now two positive real numbers $k < k'$ for which $\underline{\delta}(k')$ is a real number (i.e. not $-\infty$). Let α_n and β_n be two sequences of positive rational numbers such that $\alpha_n \to 1$, $\beta_n \to 0$, $\alpha_n+\beta_n = 1$. Let k'' be a real number such that $k < k'' < k'$. Then the inequality (7) implies:

$$\overline{\delta}(\alpha_n k+\beta_n k'') \geq \alpha_n\underline{\delta}(k)+\beta_n\underline{\delta}(k').$$

Taking the limit of both sides as $n \to \infty$ and using the monotonicity of $\overline{\delta}$ we get:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon>0,\varepsilon\to 0}\overline{\delta}(k+\varepsilon) \geq \underline{\delta}(k).$$

This inequality together with $\underline{\delta}(k+\varepsilon/2) > \overline{\delta}(k+\varepsilon)$ implies that $\underline{\delta}$ is right-continuous.

Let us now choose the sequences α_n, β_n, k_n^1, k_n^2, k_n^3 that satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_n, \beta_n \in \mathbb{Q}_+, \ \ k_n^1, k_n^2, k_n^3 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\
&\alpha_n + \beta_n = 1, \ \ \alpha_n \to 0, \ \ \beta_n \to 1, \\
&k_n^2 < k_n^3 < k < k_n^1, \ \ k_n^2, k_n^3 \nearrow k, \ \ k_n^1 \searrow k, \\
&\alpha_n k_n^1 + \beta_n k_n^2 = k.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the inequality (7) implies

$$\overline{\delta}(k) \geq \alpha_n \underline{\delta}(k_n^1) + \beta_n \underline{\delta}(k_n^3).$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ and using the monotonicity of $\underline{\delta}$ gives us:

$$\overline{\delta}(k) \geq \lim_{\varepsilon > 0, \varepsilon \to 0} \underline{\delta}(k - \varepsilon).$$

Using the fact $\underline{\delta}(k-\varepsilon) \geq \overline{\delta}(k - \varepsilon/2)$ gives that $\overline{\delta}(k) \geq \overline{\delta}(k-0)$. Here $\overline{\delta}(k-0)$ is defined as

$$\overline{\delta}(k-0) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0+} \overline{\delta}(k-\varepsilon).$$

In other words, $\overline{\delta}$ is left-continuous.

Let us now choose the sequences:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_n, \beta_n \in \mathbb{Q}_+, \ \ k_n^1, k_n^2, k_n^3 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\
&\alpha_n + \beta_n = 1, \ \ \alpha_n \to 1, \ \ \beta_n \to 0, \\
&k_n^3 > k_n^2 > k > k_n^1, \ \ k_n^2, k_n^3 \searrow k, \ \ k_n^1 \nearrow k, \\
&\alpha_n k_n^1 + \beta_n k_n^2 > k.
\end{aligned}$$

Placing these sequences in the inequality (7) gives us the following relation:

$$\underline{\delta}(k) \geq \overline{\delta}(\alpha_n k_n^1 + \beta_n k_n^2) \geq \alpha_n \underline{\delta}(k_n^1) + \beta_n \underline{\delta}(k_n^3) \geq \alpha_n \overline{\delta}(k) + \beta_n \underline{\delta}(k_n^3).$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ implies $\underline{\delta}(k) \geq \overline{\delta}(k)$. Summing up all the facts we got for $\underline{\delta}$ and $\overline{\delta}$ we have that $\underline{\delta}(k) = \overline{\delta}(k) = \gamma(k)$ for some function γ. Moreover, γ is continuous and $\gamma(\alpha k_1 + \beta k_2) \geq \alpha\gamma(k_1) + \beta\gamma(k_2)$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ such that $\alpha + \beta = 1$. Because of the continuity, the last inequality holds for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\alpha + \beta = 1$. This means that γ is concave and the equality (4) is established. Now we have the relation (3) and the concavity of the function ψ. Namely, the lemma 4.2 implies that $\psi = \gamma$.

Using the lemma 4.1 we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot l \geq nk) \quad &\leq \quad \psi(k), \ \text{ and} \\
\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot l \geq nk) \quad &\geq \quad \psi(k+\varepsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$. If k belongs to the interior of $\psi^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$, we can take $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the previous inequality and use the continuity of ψ to obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot l \geq nk) \geq \psi(k).$$

This in turn implies (1) and the concavity of ϕ. □

The Gartner-Ellis theorem will enable us to get some more information on lower and upper bound large deviations for general sets.

Definition 5.1. *Assume that* Λ^* *is a convex conjugate of the function* Λ. $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *is an* exposed point *of* Λ^* *if for some* $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *and all* $x \neq y$,

$$\lambda \cdot y - \Lambda^*(y) > \lambda \cdot x - \Lambda^*(x). \tag{8}$$

λ *in (8) is called an* exposing hyperplane.

We are now ready to prove the theorem stated in the introduction.

Theorem 5.1. *There exists a convex function* $\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^d \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ *such that* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{X_n \cdot \lambda}\right] = \Lambda(\lambda)$. *The origin belongs to the interior of the set* $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d : \Lambda(\lambda) < +\infty\}$.

Proof. As noted in the remark after the theorem 2.1 there exists a function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot l \geq kn) = \Phi\left(\frac{1}{k} l\right).$$

For each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and each $k > 0$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n \cdot \lambda}\right) &\geq \liminf \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n \cdot \lambda} \cdot 1(X_n \cdot \lambda > kn)\right) \\ &\geq \liminf \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{kn} \cdot 1(X_n \cdot \lambda > kn)\right) = k + \Phi\left(\frac{1}{k}\lambda\right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from the theorem 3.2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n \cdot \lambda}\right) &\geq \liminf \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n \cdot \lambda}\right) \\ &\geq \liminf \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{0} \cdot 1(X_n \cdot \lambda \geq 0)\right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\liminf \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n \cdot \lambda}\right) \geq \max\left\{0, \sup_{k>0}\left\{k + \Phi\left(\frac{\lambda}{k}\right)\right\}\right\}.$$

From the boundedness of jumps of the random walk X_n we have that $|X_n \cdot \lambda| < L|\lambda|$. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 = k_0 < k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_r = L|\lambda|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n \cdot \lambda}\right) &= \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \Bigg(\mathbb{E}\left((e^{X_n \cdot \lambda} \cdot 1(X_n \cdot \lambda \leq 0)\right) + \\ &\qquad \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n \cdot \lambda} \cdot 1(nk_i < X_n \cdot \lambda \leq nk_{i+1})\right)\Bigg) \\ &\leq \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot \lambda \leq 0) + \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} e^{nk_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot \lambda > nk_i)\right) \\ &\leq \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot \lambda \leq 0) + r \max_{0 \leq i \leq r-1} e^{nk_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot \lambda > nk_i)\right) \\ &= \max\left\{0, \max_{0 \leq i \leq r-1}\left\{k_{i+1} + \Phi\left(\frac{\lambda}{k_i}\right)\right\}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is true because $r \in \mathbb{N}$ is a fixed number as $n \to \infty$ and the lemma 3.2 implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_n \cdot (-\lambda) \geq 0) = 0$. The theorem 2.1 implies that the function $\Phi\left(\frac{1}{k}\lambda\right)$ is continuous in k hence taking $r \to \infty$ and $k_{i+1} - k_i$ constant we get:

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n \cdot \lambda}\right) \leq \max\left\{0, \sup_{k>0}\left\{k + \Phi\left(\frac{\lambda}{k}\right)\right\}\right\}.$$

This proves the existence of the limit in from the statement of the theorem with

$$\Lambda(\lambda)=\max\left\{0,\sup_{k>0}\left\{k+\Phi\left(\frac{\lambda}{k}\right)\right\}\right\}.$$

We will not use this representation for Λ to prove its convexity. Notice that all functions $\Lambda_n(\lambda)=\log\mathbb{E}\left(e^{X_n\cdot\lambda}\right)$ are convex when n is fixed. Indeed, for all $\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{R}_+$ with $\alpha+\beta=1$ and all $\lambda,\mu\in\mathbb{R}^d$ according to the Holder's inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\Lambda_n(\alpha\lambda+\beta\mu)} &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(e^{X_n\cdot\lambda}\right)^{\alpha}\cdot\left(e^{X_n\cdot\mu}\right)^{\beta}\right] \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{X_n\cdot\lambda}\right]\right)^{\alpha}\cdot\left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{X_n\cdot\mu}\right]\right)^{\beta}=e^{\alpha\Lambda_n(\lambda)+\beta\Lambda_n(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the limit of convex functions is convex, as well as the maximum of two convex functions, we are able to conclude that Λ is convex. Obviously, the origin belongs to the interior of the set $\{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}^d:\Lambda(\lambda)<+\infty\}$ because Λ is bounded. □

Theorem 5.2. *Let X_n be the previously defined deterministic walk in a random environment that satisfies the conditions (i)–(iii). Let Λ be the function from the theorem 5.1 and let Λ^* be its convex conjugate. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be the set of exposed points of Λ^* whose exposing hyperplane belongs to the interior of the set $\{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}^d:\Lambda(\lambda)<+\infty\}$. For any closed set $F\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\limsup\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}X_n\in F\right)\leq-\inf_{x\in F}\Lambda^*(x),$$

and for any open set $G\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$

$$\liminf\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}X_n\in G\right)\geq-\inf_{x\in G\cap\mathscr{F}}\Lambda^*(x).$$

Moreover, there exists $\delta>0$ such that $\Lambda^*(x)<+\infty$ for $|x|<\delta$.

Proof. The conditions for Gartner-Ellis theorem are now satisfied because of the theorem 5.1. Direct application of that result proves the first part of the statement.

For the second part, we will use the lemma 3.2. There exists $\kappa>0$ such that for each $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}^d$ there exists $i\in\{1,2,\dots,m\}$ such that $\lambda\cdot u_i>\kappa|\lambda|$. Then we have $\Lambda(\lambda)\geq\kappa|\lambda|+\Phi\left(\frac{\lambda}{\kappa|\lambda|}\right)$ and:

$$\Phi\left(\frac{\lambda}{\kappa|\lambda|}\right) \geq \liminf\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_1=\xi_2=\cdots=\xi_n=u_i\right)\geq c,$$

for some constant c. Therefore $\Lambda(\lambda)\geq\kappa|\lambda|+c$, and

$$\Lambda^*(x)\leq\sup_{\lambda}\{\lambda\cdot x-\kappa|\lambda|-c\leq -c+\sup_{\lambda}\{|\lambda|\cdot|x|-\kappa|\lambda|\}.$$

Hence if $|x|\leq\kappa$ then $\Lambda^*(x)\leq-c<+\infty$. □

6. LAW OF LARGE NUMBERS

Let us end with a note about the law of large numbers for this deterministic walk in a random environment. It is not surprising that the walk will have 0 limiting velocity because it is expected that the walk will eventually end in a loop.

Theorem 6.1. *If X_n is defined as before then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}(X_n)=0.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}(X_n\cdot l)=0$ for each $l\in\mathbb{R}^d$, because the zero vector is the only one orthogonal to the entire $\mathbb{R}^d$. Furthermore, the problem can be reduced to proving that $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[X_n\cdot l]^+$ converges to 0 because $X_n\cdot l=(X_n\cdot l)^+ + (X_n\cdot(-l))^+$. By the Fubini's theorem we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{n}X_n\cdot l\right)^+\right]=\int_0^{+\infty}\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l>nt)\,dt.$$

Since $\{X_n\cdot l>nt\}=\emptyset$ for $t>L$ the previous integration could be performed on the interval $(0,L)$ only. Let $x_1,\dots,x_s$ be a sequence from theorem 3.1, and let $y_k=\sum_{i=1}^k x_i$. Define the random walk Y_i as $Y_i=X_{s+i}$. The probability that the walk will reach the half-space H^l_{nt} before time n is smaller than the probability of the following event: The walk does not make a loop in first s steps, and after that it reaches the half-space H^l_{nt-sL}. Therefore we deduce that for each $t\in(0,L)$ the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l>nt) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[1((X_1,\dots,X_s)\neq(y_1,\dots,y_s))\cdot 1(Y_{n-s}\cdot l\geq nt-sL)\right]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[1((X_1,\dots,X_s)\neq(y_1,\dots,y_s))\cdot 1(Y_{n-s}\cdot l\geq nt-sL)|\mathscr{F}_{Y_1,\dots,Y_{n-s}}\right]\right],\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathscr{F}_{Y_1,\dots,Y_s}$ is a σ-field determined by η_z for all $z\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{X_1,\dots,X_s\}$ such that $\min_{i=1}^n|z-X_i|\leq M$. The previous inequality now implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq nt) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[1(Y_{n-s}\geq nt-sL)\cdot\right.\\ &\qquad \left.\mathbb{E}\left[1((X_1,\dots,X_s)\neq(y_1,\dots,y_s))|\mathscr{F}_{Y_1,\dots,Y_{n-s}}\right]\right].\end{aligned}$$

From theorem 3.1 we have that $\mathbb{E}\left[1((X_1,\dots,X_s)\neq(y_1,\dots,y_s))|\mathscr{F}_{Y_1,\dots,Y_{n-s}}\right]\leq 1-c$ for some constant $c>0$. Let us denote $g=1-c$. We know that $g\in(0,1)$. Using mathematical induction, we can repeat the previous sequence of inequalities $[nt/sL]$ times to obtain that $\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l\geq nt)\leq g^{[nt/sL]}$. Now we have that for all $t_0>0$ the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}(X_n\cdot l)^+ &= \int_0^L\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l>nt)\,dt\\ &= \int_0^{t_0}\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l>nt)\,dt+\int_{t_0}^L\mathbb{P}(X_n\cdot l>nt)\,dt\\ &\leq t_0+(L-t_0)\cdot g^{[nt_0/sL]}\\ &\leq t_0+L\cdot g^{[nt_0/sL]}.\end{aligned}$$

If we keep t_0 fixed and let $n\to\infty$ it is easy to see that the last quantity converges to 0. Therefore $\limsup\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}(X_n\cdot l)^+\leq t_0$. However, this holds for every $t_0>0$ hence $\limsup\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}(X_n\cdot l)^+\leq 0$. This finishes the proof of the theorem. ☐

7. PROCESSES IN RANDOM ENVIRONMENTS WITH TELEPORTS

Our aim is to study the continuous time process X_t on $(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$ that solves the following ODE:

$$\frac{dX_t}{dt} = b(\tau_{X_t}\omega). \tag{9}$$

As before, in order to prove the theorem 1.1 we are looking at the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(X_t\cdot l>kt)$ for fixed $l\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and fixed $k>0$.

Let us first outline the main difficulties we have in trying to implement the proof of 2.1 to the continuous setting. The proof of the lemma 4.2 used the fact that by time n, the walk could jump only n times over the hyperplane through 0. The continuous process could jump infinitely many times over that hyperplane and those jumps could happen in relatively short time. Instead, we will look at a strip around 0 of positive width. By strip we mean the region of the space between two hyperplanes orthogonal to l. The process can't travel over the strip infinitely many times, because the speed is finite. Thus we will require our process not to backtrack over the hyperplane Z_{-w} for suitable $w > 0$. Since this is not enough to separate the process and prove the inequality (5) our goal is to prove that the probability of the event that the process doesn't backtrack over the hyperplane Z_{-w} is comparable to the probability that the process doesn't backtrack over Z_0. The difficulty here comes from the fact that the process can approach Z_0 with slow speed and it can in some way introduce a lot of dependence in the environment. This can happen especially if there is a lot of continuity of the process b. We introduce additional assumptions to have more randomness in the definition of X_t and that randomness helps the process to escape from such environments. So, we will have some assumptions that continuous processes can't satisfy. It turns out that the bounded process won't satisfy some of the requirements, either.

We will consider a Poisson point process independent of the environment. We will assume that the balls of radius r centered at the points of the process serve as "teleports," and our process evolves according to (9) until it spends a fixed positive time in some of the teleports. Once that happens, the process will reappear at another location. In some sense, these teleports correspond to the locations where b is infinite.

We will also assume that the vector field b has an option of discontinuous change on the lines of the grid $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

The existence of teleports and discontinuities will help us build tunnels that can take the process in the directions we wish it to travel. Also we will be able to build traps that can hold the process for long time. It is quite possible (and believable) that the process will have the traps, tunnels, and means of escaping other than teleports, but proving such statements turned out to be difficult. Often some other assumptions are necessary to made and then one has to deal with tedious work with conditional distributions and some types of adaptations of Brownian bridges to this deterministic setting.

In order to use the arguments based on subadditivity we need the stationarity of the underlying random field. Our assumptions are going to make the grid $\mathbb{Z}^d$ special, so we can't hope for general stationarity. We will assume only that $\mathbb{P}(A)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tau_z A)$ have same distributions for $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. This is going to be sufficient for our purposes, because we will assume that after each teleportation the process will appear at the point that experiences the same distribution as the initial point.

The initial position of the process is assumed to be chosen uniformly inside the unit cube $[0,1]^d$. The random choice of the point is assumed to be independent from the rest of the environment.

For each unit cube Q of the lattice, denote by $\mathscr{F}_{Q,0}$ the σ-algebra generated by the environment in the complement of Q.

We require the following assumptions:

(i) There is $\delta_0 > 0$ and a positive real number c such that for each lattice cube Q of edge length 1 and each vector $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(b(\tau_z\omega)\cdot l > \delta_0 \text{ for all } z \in Q | \mathscr{F}_{Q^C}) > c.$$

(ii) The vector field b is bounded and it has finite range dependence, i.e., there are positive constants L and M such that $|b(\omega)| \leq L$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, and $b(\tau_x\omega)$ is independent of the σ-field generated by the environment outside of the ball $B(x,M)$.

(iii) Fix $r \in \left(0, \frac{1}{4\sqrt{d}}\right)$ and $t_0 > 0$ such that $t_0 < \frac{r}{4L}$. Fix also $c_3 \in (0,1)$, $\lambda_0 > 0$, and a sequence Y_n of iid random variables with values in $\{\phi\} \cup [0,1]^d$. Each Y_n has a probability c_3 of being ϕ, or (with probability $1-c_3$) it is uniformly distributed in $[0,1]^d$. There exist a set of vectors $\{u_1,\dots,u_m\} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for each $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there is $i \in \{1,2,\dots,m\}$ that satisfies

$$\text{dist}\,(l\cdot(B_r+u_i), l\cdot B_r) > 2\sqrt{d}.$$

> Here B_r denotes the ball of radius r. For each i, we consider a Poisson point process of intensity λ_0, and each point x of that process will form a (u_i, t_0)-teleport. This means that if the process X_t spent the entire time interval $(t-t_0, t)$ in the ball $B_r(x)$, then at time t the process X_t will either stay at the same place if $Y_{\lfloor t/t_0 \rfloor} = \phi$ or reappear in the lattice cube closest to $X_t + u_i$ at the relative position $Y_{\lfloor t/t_0 \rfloor}$ within the cube.

Notice that by fixing the time t_0 we make sure that the average speed of X_t remains bounded. Although, there is a teleportation involved, the particle has to wait to be teleported and the distance it can go is bounded.

There could be regions belonging to more than one teleport. If the particle is a subject to two teleportation, then the jump will be suppressed. A particle could be subject to more than one teleportation if it enters the teleport by jump. Entering two teleports simultaneously by the means of diffusion is a zero-probability event.

The requirement $t_0 < \frac{L}{4r}$ guarantees that if the process comes to within $r/2$ to the Poisson point, it is going to be teleported for sure, because it won't have enough time to escape.

For a fixed vector $l \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ we consider the moment-generating function $\mathbb{E}(\exp(\lambda X_t))$ and we want to prove that there is a convex function Λ such that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E}(\exp(\lambda X_t)) = \Lambda(\lambda).$$

We recall the definition of the hitting times of the hyperplanes T_p for $p \in \mathbb{R}^+$ from the section 4. In this continuous case we have an analogous result to the lemma 4.1.

Lemma 7.1. *The following inequality holds:*

$$\limsup_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(X_t \cdot l \geq tk) \quad \leq \quad \limsup_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{tk} \leq t)$$

In addition, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we have:

$$\liminf_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{t(k+\varepsilon)} \leq t) \quad \leq \quad \liminf_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(X_t \cdot l \geq tk).$$

Proof. The first inequality follows immediately as in the discrete case. For the second one we have to modify the argument a bit. We are not able to construct a loop as we did in the discrete case. The reason is that the curve X_t will not have a self intersections in some cases (an example is when b is a gradient of a function).

Denote by $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ the set of points whose each coordinate belongs to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. Denote the points of S by P_0, P_1, P_2, ..., P_{3^d-1}. Assume that P_0 coincides with the origin O. Let C_i $(0 \leq i \leq 3^d - 1)$ be the cube with center P_i and side length 1. For each integer $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 3^d - 1\}$, consider the event

$$D_i = \left\{ b(\tau_z \omega) \cdot \overrightarrow{P_i O} > \frac{\delta_0}{2} \right\}.$$

Let $D = \bigcap_{i=1}^{3^d-1} D_i \cap D'$, where D' is the event that there are no Poisson points in the r-neighborhood of C_0. Denote by $\mathscr{F}_{C_1,\dots,C_{3^d-1}}$ the sigma algebra generated by the environment in $\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{3^d-1} C_i \right)^C$. According to our assumptions, we have $\mathbb{P}\left(D \mid \mathscr{F}_{C_1,\dots C_{3^d-1}} \right) > 0$. Notice that if the process ever enters the cube C_0, it will stay there forever. We will show that if $X_{t_0} \in C_0$, then for each $t \geq t_0$ we have $X_t \in C_0$. It suffices to prove that $X_t \notin C_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, 3^d - 1\}$. Assume the contrary, that $X_t \in C_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, 3^d - 1\}$. Let $Y_t = \overrightarrow{OX_t} \cdot \overrightarrow{P_i O}$. Set $t_1 = \inf\{s : X_u \in C_i \text{ for all } u \in (s, t)\}$.

Then $Y_t < Y_{t_1}$. Using the fundamental theorem of calculus we have

$$0 > Y_t - Y_{t_1} = \int_{t_1}^{t} \overrightarrow{P_iO} \cdot b(\tau_{X_s}\omega)\, ds > 0,$$

since $\overrightarrow{P_iO} \cdot b(\tau_{X_s}\omega) > 0$ for all $s \in (t_1, t)$ on the event D_i. Therefore, X_t can't enter the interior of any of the cells C_i, proving that the process X_t is trapped in the cell C_0.

Now we can finish the proof in the similar way as in the discrete case. Let $s > 0$ and let S_{kt} denote the "shard"-like surface consisting of faces of the grid of size 3 that is in front of the plane Z_{tk} (here "in front of" means with respect to the direction l). Let $\hat{T}_{tk} = T_{S_{tk}}$. Denote by C the translation of cube $\bigcup_{i=0}^{3^d-1} C_i$ with the following properties: C contains the point $X_{\hat{T}_{tk}}$ on one of its faces, and is on different side of S_{tk} than the origin. Denote by $\hat{D}$ the event that the environment in C is as explained before. Denote by $\hat{E}$ the event that $Y_{\lfloor \hat{T}_{tk}/t_0 \rfloor} = \phi$. Using conditioning we get

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathbb{P}(X_t \cdot l \geq kt) & = & \mathbb{P}(X_t \cdot l \geq kt, T_{kt} \leq t) \\
& \geq & \mathbb{P}\left(X_t \cdot l \geq kt, \hat{T}_{kt} \leq t, \hat{D}\right) \\
& = & \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{T}_{kt} \leq t) \cdot 1(X_t \cdot l \geq kt) \cdot 1(\hat{D}) \mid \mathscr{F}_{\hat{T}_{kt}}\right]\right] \\
& = & \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{T}_{kt} \leq t) \cdot 1(X_t \cdot l \geq kt) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{D}) \mid \mathscr{F}_{\hat{T}_{kt}}\right]\right].
\end{array}$$

Denote by R the right-hand side of the last inequality. Let $\hat{F}$ be the event that there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $t_1 \in \left(t_0 \lfloor \frac{\hat{T}_{tk}}{t_0} \rfloor, \hat{T}_{tk}\right)$ such that X_t spent all the time $(t_1 - t_0, t_1)$ in a u_i-teleport. Then we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
R & = & \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{T}_{kt} \leq t) \cdot 1(X_t \cdot l \geq kt) \cdot 1(\hat{F}) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{D}) \mid \mathscr{F}_{\hat{T}_{kt}}\right]\right] \\
& & + \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{T}_{kt} \leq t) \cdot 1(X_t \cdot l \geq kt) \cdot 1(\hat{F}^C) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{D}) \mid \mathscr{F}_{\hat{T}_{kt}}\right]\right].
\end{array} \tag{10}$$

Consider the first summand on the right hand side of the previous inequality. On the event $\hat{F}$ we know that the random variable $Y_{\lfloor \hat{T}_{tk}/t_0 \rfloor}$ will not be responsible for any further jumps. The process already spent a lot of time in a teleport, so the value of $Y_{\lfloor \hat{T}_{tk}/t_0 \rfloor}$ was already used in making the decision whether there will be a jump or not. We don't care about the outcome, because the process reached the level S_{nk}, but we know for sure that a single value of Y can't be responsible for two decisions about jumps. Hence the event

$$\hat{G} = \left\{ Y_{1 + \lfloor \hat{T}_{tk}/t_0 \rfloor} = \cdots = Y_{\lfloor \hat{T}_{tk}/t_0 \rfloor + \lceil \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{\delta_0} \rceil} = \phi \right\}$$

is sufficient to assure that the path X_t will enter the trap before having any possible jumps. There are only finitely many terms listed in this sequence, so the probability of $\hat{G}$ is strictly positive. We also have that $1(X_t \cdot l \geq kl) = 1$ in the intersection $\hat{D} \cap \hat{E} \cap \hat{F} \cap \{\hat{T}_{tk} \leq t\}$. Hence there is a constant c' such that on the event $\hat{F}$ we have $\mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{D}) \mid \mathscr{F}_{\hat{T}_{kt}}\right] \geq c'$. Thus we can bound from below the first summand by $c' \cdot \mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_{kt} \leq t, \hat{F})$.

Let us now consider the second summand. Notice that

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{T}_{kt} \leq t) \cdot 1(X_t \cdot l \geq kt) \cdot 1(\hat{F}^C) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{D}) \mid \mathscr{F}_{\hat{T}_{kt}}\right]\right] \\
\qquad \geq \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{T}_{kt} \leq t) \cdot 1(X_t \cdot l \geq kt) \cdot 1(\hat{E}) \cdot 1(\hat{F}^C) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{D}) \mid \mathscr{F}_{\hat{T}_{kt}}\right]\right].
\end{array} \tag{11}$$

Let $\hat{G}$ be the same set as above. The identity $1(X_t \cdot l \geq kt) = 1$ holds as before, because on the set $\hat{E} \cap \hat{G}$ the process will enter the trap. The unfortunate thing is that we had to modify the past, by introducing the event $\hat{E}$. In the same way as in the case of the first summand of (10) we can bound from below the second expression from (11) by $c'\mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_{kt} \le t, \hat{E}, \hat{F}^C)$. On the event $\{T_{kt} \le t, \hat{F}^C\}$ we know that the process reached the level S_{kt} by time t and it didn't spend sufficient time in a teleport to be considered for a jump in which $Y_{\lfloor \hat{T}_{kt}/t_0 \rfloor}$ would play a deciding role. Therefore $\hat{E}$ is independent of $\{\hat{T}_{kt} \le t, \hat{F}^C\}$ hence

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_{kt} \le t, \hat{E}, \hat{F}^C) = \mathbb{P}(\hat{E}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_{kt} \le t, \hat{F}^C) = c_3 \cdot \mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_{kt} \le t, \hat{F}^C).$$

This allows us to conclude that there is a constant $c'' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_t \cdot l \ge kt) &\ge c''\left(\mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_{kt} \le t, \hat{F}) + \mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_{kt} \le t, \hat{F}^C)\right) = c''\mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_{kt} \le t) \\ &\ge c''\mathbb{P}(T_{kt+5\sqrt{d}} \le t). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the logarithm of both sides of the last inequality, dividing by t, and taking the $\liminf$ as $t \to +\infty$ one obtains the following inequality

$$\liminf_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(X_t \cdot l \ge kt) \ge \liminf_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{kt+5\sqrt{d}} \le t).$$

For each ε, there exists t_0 such that every $t > t_0$ satisfies $\left\{T_{(k+\varepsilon)(t)} \le t-s\right\} \subseteq \left\{T_{kt+5\sqrt{d}} \le t-s\right\}$. Thus

$$\liminf_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(X_t \cdot l \ge kt) \ge \liminf_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{(k+\varepsilon)t} \le t).$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Following the approach from the discrete case our goal is to establish a statement similar to the lemma 4.2.

Lemma 7.2. *Let k and k' be two real numbers such that $0 < k' < k$. Then the following two inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{tk} \le t) &\le \limsup \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{tk'} \le t, T_{tk'} \le D_1) \\ \liminf \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}\left(T_{tk} \le t, T_{tk} \le D_1\right) &\le \liminf \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}\left(T_{tk} \le t\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The second inequality is obvious since $\{T_{kt} \le t, T_{kt} \le D_1\} \subseteq \{T_{kt} \le t\}$. Our proof of the first inequality from the lemma 4.2 used the fact that the number of crossings of the walk is finite. Obviously, we can't use that fact in the continuous setting. The idea is to break the process between its crossings of a strip between hyperplanes Z_{-w} and Z_0, where w is some fixed real number from the interval $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Define the following stopping times: $G_0 = 0$, $F_0 = \inf\{t : X_t \cdot l \le -w\}$. Having defined G_i and F_i, for $i \ge 0$, we inductively define

$$\begin{aligned} G_{i+1} &= \inf\{t \ge F_i : X_t \cdot l \ge 0\} \\ F_{i+1} &= \inf\{t \ge G_{i+1} : X_t \cdot l \le -w\}. \end{aligned}$$

We will need the following lemma:

Lemma 7.3. *For any two real numbers k and k' satisfying $0 < k' < k$ we have*

$$\limsup \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{tk \le t}, T_{tk} \le F_0) \le \limsup \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{tk'} \le t, T_{tk'} \le D_1).$$

Proof. There is at least one of the vectors from the assumption (iii), say u_1, such that $\operatorname{dist}\left((B_r + u_1) \cdot l, B_r \cdot l\right) > 2$. Let B be the event that for each z in the cells adjacent to the origin we have $b(\tau_z \omega) \cdot l > 0$ and that the origin is at a distance smaller than $\frac{1}{2}r$ of a (u_1, t_0) teleport, and that the origin is at a distance at least r from any other teleport. The conditional probabilities of that event are bounded below by a constant. By the time t_0 the process will be away from the origin. Denote by $\tilde{X}$ the process defined by $\tilde{X}_t = X_{t+t_0}$. Let $\tilde{G}_i$ and $\tilde{F}_i$ denote the stopping times corresponding to the process $\tilde{X}$ which are analogous to the stopping times G_i and F_i. Let $\tilde{B}$ denote the process that the each point in the unit $d-1$-dimensional ball of radius $\max_i\{|u_i|\}$ in the hyperplane $Z_{-u_i\cdot l}$ is at a distance $\frac{1}{4}r$ to a (u_1,t_0) teleport. The probability of that event is strictly positive and the event is independent on the σ-algebra generated by the environment in the positive l-direction of the hyperplane Z_0. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(T_{tk'} \leq t, T_{tk'} \leq D_1) &\geq \mathbb{P}(T_{tk'} \leq t, T_{tk'} \leq D_1, B)\\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{T}_{tk'} \leq t-t_0, \tilde{T}_{tk'} \leq \tilde{F}_0, \tilde{B})\\ &\geq c\cdot\mathbb{P}(T_{tk'} \leq t-t_0, T_{tk'} \leq F_0).\end{aligned}$$

It remains to notice that for sufficiently large t we have that $tk' \leq (t-t_0)k$, hence

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{tk'} \leq t-t_0) \geq \mathbb{P}(T_{(t-t_0)k} \leq t-t_0).$$

This completes the proof of the lemma 7.3. $\square$

For any real number $u>0$ we write the event $\{T_u \leq t\}$ as the following union:

$$\{T_u \leq t\} = \{T_u \leq t, T_u \leq F_0\} \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty}\{T_u \leq t, F_i \leq T_u \leq F_{i+1}\}.$$

The last union turns out to be finite, because we can prove that if $T_u \leq t$, then $T_u \leq F_{\lceil t|l|\rceil}$. We first find a lower bound on $F_{\lceil u\rceil}$. The fundamental theorem of calculus implies

$$-w = X_{F_i}\cdot l - X_{G_i}\cdot l = \int_{G_i}^{F_i} b(\tau_{X_s}\omega)\cdot l\,ds \geq -L\cdot|l|\cdot(F_i-G_i)$$

which together with $|l|=1$ yields $F_i - G_i \geq \frac{1}{|l|}$. Using this inequality we obtain

$$F_m = F_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m}(F_i - F_{i-1}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m}(F_i - G_i) \geq \frac{wm}{L}.$$

Therefore $F_{\lceil tL/w\rceil} \geq t$ and on $T_u \leq t$ we immediately get $F_{\lceil tL/w\rceil} \leq T_u$. This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_u \leq t) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \frac{tL}{w}\rceil}\mathbb{P}(T_u \leq t, F_i \leq T_u \leq F_{i+1}).$$

Let us prove that each term on the right hand side of the last inequality can be bounded by the quantity $\mathbb{P}(T_u \leq t, T_u \leq F_0)$. Denote by $\mathscr{F}_{G_{i+1},T_u}$ the sigma algebra generated by the environment contained in the M-neighborhood of the process from G_{i+1} to T_u. Notice that if $T_u \leq t$ and $T_u \geq F_i$, then the process has made at least i trips over the region between the hyperplanes Z_0 and Z_{-w}. Since $T_u \leq F_{i+1}$ and $T_u \leq t$ we conclude that the process has crossed the hyperplane Z_u by time t which means that it had to cross the hyperplane Z_0 again. Therefore $G_{i+1} \leq t$. Let $\tilde{X}$ be the process starting at time G_{i+1}. More precisely, we define $\tilde{X}_t = X_{G_{i+1}+t}$. We use $\tilde{F}_i$ and $\tilde{G}_i$ to denote the stopping times for $\tilde{X}_t$ analogous to F_i and G_i.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(T_u \leq t, F_i \leq T_u \leq F_{i+1}) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u \leq t)\cdot 1(T_u \geq F_i)\cdot 1(T_u \leq F_{i+1})|\mathscr{F}_{G_{i+1},T_u}\right]\right]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[1(\tilde{T}_u \leq t-G_{i+1})\cdot 1(T_u \geq F_i)\cdot 1(\tilde{T}_u \leq \tilde{F}_0)|\mathscr{F}_{G_{i+1},T_u}\right]\right]\\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[1(\tilde{T}_u \leq t)\cdot 1(\tilde{T}_u \leq \tilde{F}_0)\cdot\mathbb{E}\left[1(T_u \geq F_i)|\mathscr{F}_{G_{i+1},T_u}\right]\right].\end{aligned}$$

The last conditional expectation can be bounded above by 1. Although our process does not posses Markov property, we can use the trivial bounds on the indicator functions, namely $1(T_u \geq F_i) \leq 1$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(T_u \leq t) \leq \left\lceil \frac{tL}{w} \right\rceil \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_u \leq t, T_u \leq F_0).$$

Placing $u = tk$ and using the lemma 7.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{tk} \leq t) &\leq \lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log t + \limsup \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{tk} \leq t, T_{tk} \leq F_0) \\ &\leq \limsup \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(T_{tk'} \leq t, T_{tk'} \leq D_1), \end{aligned}$$

for any two real numbers k' and k such that $0 < k' < k$. ☐

Proof of the Theorem 1.1. The proof will proceed in the same way as in the discrete case once we establish the inequality (5). Denote by Q the parallelepiped $\{\lceil 2L \rceil\} \times [-5,5]^{d-1}$. Similarly to the proof of the lemma 7.1, denote by S_u the surface consisting only of faces of the grid of size $\lceil 2L \rceil$ that is in front of Z_u when looking from the origin in the direction l. Denote by Q_u the appropriate isometric transformation of Q to be on the side of S_u opposite to the origin such that Q_u contains on one of its faces the hitting point of S_u by the process X_t.

Denote by B_1 the event that after reaching the surface S_u the process encounters the environment that is going to take it to through the parallelepiped Q_u in time less than $4L/\delta_0$.

Such an environment can be constructed by requiring that in the central cells of Q_u satisfy $b \cdot l > \frac{\delta_0}{2}$. In outer cells of Q_u the environment acts as a trap and brings the process towards the middle cells. That way our parallelepiped acts as a tunnel through which the process must go. This reduces the portion of the environment that gets exposed to the process, and plays a role of the sequence of steps of size w that we used in proving (5). In the end of the tunnel Q_u we require that the environment has a set of teleports in the direction u_1, while before the end there are no teleports overlapping with the tube. The probability of such an environment Q_u is still positive, and we are sure that after the passage through the tunnel the process will appear at uniform location within a cube. We may also assume that the furthest face of the parallelepiped Q_u is "almost parallel" to the hyperplane Z_u. The problem is that the vector l, and consequently the planes Z_u, are at an angle with respect to grid, and we want our last teleports to be decently aligned, so that we are sure that they are not going to protrude to the environment after the jump.

Let B_2 be the event that at any moment that is within t_0 of the time of hitting the surface S_u, the process did not spend a time longer that t_0 within a teleport. The precise definition of B_2 is the same as the definition of $\hat{F}$ in the proof of lemma 7.1.

Denote by $\hat{T}_u$ the hitting time of S_u. We have the following sequence of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1, T_u \leq p\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[1(\hat{T}_u \leq p) \cdot 1(B_1) \cdot 1(T_{u+v} \leq p+q) \cdot 1(T_{u+v} \leq D_1)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\Big[1(\hat{T}_u \leq p) \cdot 1(B_1) \cdot 1(T_{u+v} \leq p+q) \cdot 1(T_{u+v} \leq D_1) \big| \mathscr{F}_{[X_{\hat{T}_u}, X_{\hat{T}_u+2L}]}\Big]\Big], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathscr{F}_{[a,b]}$ is the σ-algebra determined by the environment outside of the strip $[Z_a, Z_b]$. Let us introduce the following notation: $\tilde{X}_t = X_{\hat{T}_u+2L+t}$, $\tilde{D}_1$ the first time $\tilde{X}_t$ backtracks over $Z_{X_{\hat{T}_u+2L}}$, and

$\tilde{T}_v = \inf\{t : \tilde{X}_t \cdot l \geq v\}$. Let $r = \frac{2L}{\delta_0}$. We now have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1) & \\ \geq \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\Big[1(\hat{T}_u \leq p) \cdot 1(B_1) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq q-r) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq \tilde{D}_1)\Big|\mathscr{F}_{[X_{\hat{T}_u}, X_{\hat{T}_u+2L}]}\Big]\Big]&.\end{aligned}$$

Since $1(B_1) \in \mathscr{F}_{[X_{\hat{T}_u}, X_{\hat{T}_u+2L}]}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\Big[1(\hat{T}_u \leq p) \cdot 1(B_1) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq q-r) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq \tilde{D}_1)\Big|\mathscr{F}_{\left[X_{\hat{T}_u}, X_{\hat{T}_u+2L}\right]}\Big]\Big] \\ &\quad = \mathbb{E}\Big[1(\hat{T}_u \leq p) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq q-r) \cdot 1(\hat{T}_u \leq D_1) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq \tilde{D}_1) \cdot 1(B_2) \cdot \mathbb{E}\Big[1(B_1)\Big|\mathscr{F}_{\left[X_{\hat{T}_u}, X_{\hat{T}_u+2L}\right]}\Big]\Big] \\ &\quad\quad + \mathbb{E}\Big[1(\hat{T}_u \leq p) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq q-r) \cdot 1(\hat{T}_u \leq D_1) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq \tilde{D}_1) \cdot 1(B_2^C) \cdot \mathbb{E}\Big[1(B_1)\Big|\mathscr{F}_{\left[X_{\hat{T}_u}, X_{\hat{T}_u+2L}\right]}\Big]\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Now we bound each of the two terms on the right hand side in the same way as we did in the proof of the lemma 7.1 to get

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1) \geq c \cdot \mathbb{E}(1(\hat{T}_u \leq p) \cdot 1(\hat{T}_u \leq D_1) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq q) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_v \leq \tilde{D}_1)).$$

We can now replace $\tilde{X}$ with a process on the independent environment because it is sufficiently far away from X and use the independence to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(T_{u+v} \leq p+q, T_{u+v} \leq D_1) &\geq c \cdot \mathbb{P}(\hat{T}_u \leq p, \hat{T}_u \leq D_1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_v \leq q-r, T_v \leq D_1) \\ &\geq c' \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_u \leq p, T_u \leq D_1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_v \leq q-r, T_v \leq D_1).\end{aligned}$$

We can now proceed in the same way as in the case of the deterministic walk and establish the existence of the limit of the moment generating function. This completes the proof of 1.1. ☐

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank my advisor, professor Fraydoun Rezakhanlou, for formulating the probability model that was studied here and for excellent ideas and advices on how to approach the problem. I would also like to thank Firas Rassoul-Agha and Atilla Yilmaz for numerous discussions.

REFERENCES

[1] Aldous, David J. *Self-intersections of 1-dimensional random walks.* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 72 (1986), no. 4, 559–587.
[2] Asselah, Amine *Large deviations estimates for self-intersection local times for simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^3$.* Probab. Theory Related Fields 141 (2008), no. 1-2, 19–45.
[3] Dembo, Amir; Zeitouni, Ofer *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications* 2nd ed. Applications of Mathematics (New York) 38. Springer, New York.
[4] Kosygina, Elena; Rezakhanlou, Fraydoun; Varadhan, S. R. S. *Stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 59 (2006), no. 10, 1489–1521.
[5] Rassoul-Agha, Firas *Large deviations for random walks in a mixing random environment and other (non-Markov) random walks.*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 57 (2004), no. 9, 1178–1196.
[6] Rassoul-Agha, Firas; Seppalainen, Timo *Process-level quenched large deviations for random walk in random environment.*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Probab. Statist., 47, 214–242 (2011)
[7] Rassoul-Agha, Firas; Seppalainen, Timo; Yilmaz, Attila, *In Preparation*
[8] Rezakhanlou, Fraydoun; Tarver, James E. *Homogenization for stochastic Hamilton - Jacobi equations.* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 151 (2000), no. 4, 277–309.
[9] Rosenbluth, Jeffrey *Quenched large deviations for multidimensional random walk in random environment: a variational formula.* Ph.D. thesis, New York University. (2006) arXiv:0804.1444v1
[10] Shen, Lian *On ballistic diffusions in random environment*Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Probab. Statist., 39, 839–876 (2003)

[11] Steele, J. Michael *Probability theory and combinatorial optimization.* CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, 69. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1997.

[12] Sznitman, Alain-Sol; Zerner, Martin *A law of large numbers for random walks in random environment.* Ann. Probab. 27 (1999), no. 4, 1851–1869.

[13] Varadhan, S. R. S. *Random walks in a random environment.*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. 114 (2004), no. 4, 309–318.

[14] Yilmaz, Atilla *Large deviations for random walk in a space-time product environment.* Ann. Probab. 37 (2009), no. 1, 189–205.

E-mail address: `matic@math.duke.edu`

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, DUKE UNIVERSITY, 117 PHYSICS BUILDING, DUKE, NC 27708, USA